COPY OF PETITION

of

The Edmonton Chamber of Commerce

For the Disallowance of Certain Acts

of the

Legislature of Alberta

Passed at the 1938 Session

Edmonton - - - May 11th, 1938

THE EDMONTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Foreword

The interests of all other provinces and the fair name of Canada among the nations will suffer if policies of confiscation and repudiation go unchecked in Alberta. As an organization of business men we are deeply concerned with the welfare of the whole of Canada because modern business knows no territorial limits.

Very briefly the following are the main facts. The great depression, world-wide but bearing most heavily on primary producers had disastrous effects on our whole economy. Our farmers at the bottom and compared with the pre-war relationship received only one third as much in terms of their costs. Happily, so far as price relationships are concerned, the depression was over for us by the autumn of 1936. In consequence and except for partial crop failures, ordinary current business is approaching normal. Two things remain to be done. The first is to restore that important element in the economy of the country, the production of capital goods—the things which last as contrasted with the things which are used up day by day. For us this means mainly the construction industry. The second is to achieve the greatest possible measure of equality of sacrifice in making good the losses and repairing the damage.

To attack this problem of rehabilitation from the point of view of only one section of Canada leaving out of consideration all the rest of Canada, and to attack it in the interest of one class of the community neglecting all other classes is not only contrary to the whole spirit of Confederation but will, if unchecked, do far more harm than good to the very people it it supposed to help.

We agree emphatically with the recent pronouncement by the Honorable the Federal Minister of Trade and Commerce that one of the greatest drawbacks so far as Canada is concerned is lack of confidence. He said people entertain fear as to what might happen and as a result enterprise is at a standstill. The pity of it is that the economic experiments of the Alberta Government are among the main causes of the lack of confidence and enterprise throughout the whole of Canada. But for those experiments and with the great developments of oil in the south and mining in the north superadded to the steady development in agricultural production, Alberta would be a prime source of that confidence and a most promising field for that enterprise.

63.10.31/10

We should add that, in advance of their enactment, we made vigorous representations to the Alberta Government against all such measures as we are now asking to have disallowed. We pointed out their inimical effect on general business and their tendency to destroy confidence; that they would prevent outside capital from entering Alberta for the legitimate use and development of agriculture, trade and industry; that they would inflict loss on thousands who in the past had lent funds in good faith and that they were in substance confiscation.

We should add, too, our belief that such measures would be enacted only by those whose open and avowed object it is to destroy the existing system and to attempt something entirely new. They seem undeterred by the fact that the highest Court in Canada has declared such an attempt to be beyond provincial powers. These measures for the destruction of the existing order by repudiation of contracts and by confiscation of property must be regarded as part and parcel of that visionary and unconstitutional attempt.

Apart from the question of heavy losses in respect of their past business, Dominion Companies, Companies incorporated in other provinces and private citizens of the rest of Canada, all have a heavy interest in being able to transact business in Alberta as Albertans have an interest to do business with them. It all forms part of the general economy of Canada as a whole.

Poverty is most unfortunate. Default may be unavoidable. But confiscation and repudiation strike at the very foundations of civilized society. We doubt whether the outside world will make fine territorial distinctions. Indeed, having, as we believe, the power to disallow such Acts will our good friends especially in Great Britain and the United States hold Canada quite blameless if that power be not exercised?

We are submitting copies of our Petition with this Foreword to business organizations throughout Canada in the hope that if they have not already done so they will present similar petitions. We are sending copies also to the Press and to public men soliciting their support. We do this, as we petition for Disallowance of the Acts in question, in the solemn conviction that they are "repugnant to the general public interest of Canada as a whole".

Yours faithfully,

EDMONTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,

JOHN BLUE,

Manager-Secretary.

May 11th, 1938.

THE EDMONTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Copy of Petition

IN THE MATTER OF five Statutes enacted by the Legislature of the Province of Alberta at the Sixth Session of the eighth Legislature held in the year 1938 namely:

(1) "The Home Owners Security Act", Chapter 29.
(2) "The Debt Adjustment Act 1937 Amendment Act 1938", Chapter 27.
(3) "The Limitation of Actions Act 1935 Amendment Act 1938", Chapter 28.
(4) "The Tax Recovery Act 1938", Chapter 82; and
(5) "The 1938 Securities Tax Act" Chapter 7.

PETITION FOR DISALLOWANCE

TO HIS EXCELLENCY the GOVERNOR GENERAL of CANADA in COUNCIL:

THE PETITION of the undersigned, the Edmonton Chamber of Commerce, of the City of Edmonton, in the Province of Alberta

HUMBLY SHEWETH:

1. In August 1935 there was elected to office in the Province of Alberta a government (hereinafter referred to as the Social Credit Government) whose avowed object is to establish "a new economic order", to abolish in so far as Alberta is concerned the present economic order and the present monetary system of Canada as "obsolete", and to issue and circulate a new medium of exchange in Alberta under the control of the Alberta Government as a substitute for money.

2. Since its election, the Social Credit Government has called and held six Sessions of the Alberta Legislative Assembly, two in 1936, three in 1937 and one—which has just recently prorogued—in 1938.

3. Much legislation has been passed at those six Sessions in pursuance of the avowed Social Credit object above mentioned. It may broadly be classified under four headings as part of one general scheme, and, as your Petitioners submit, a scheme and objectives beyond Provincial legislative competence and against the general interest of Canada.

4. The first heading covers a series of Statutes affecting interest, public and private, declared by the Courts in a number of actions by trustees,

fraternal organizations and others as being an invasion of the legislative field of the Parliament of Canada and therefore *ultra vires*.

5. Secondly, although the monetary and banking system of Canada including Alberta, and trade and commerce in the Dominion necessarily interlock, and lie within the paramount and exclusive legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada, and although well aware of the limits of subjects and area within which a local legislature, such as the Alberta Legislature, has legislative authority, the Social Credit Government of Alberta did not hesitate, in the language of the Right Honourable Ernest Lapointe, Minister of Justice, unmistakably to invade the field of exclusive legislative authority conferred upon the Parliament of Canada by Section 91 of the British North America Act, and deliberately to attempt to interfere with the operation of Dominion laws. This led to the disallowance of three Alberta Statutes by your Excellency-in-Council on the 17th August 1937. (P.C. 1985).

6. Under the third heading is to be found a still further attempt on the part of the Social Credit Government to step out of the sphere of Provincial authority and to interfere with and invade the exclusive legislative rights of Parliament. This occurred at the third Alberta Session in 1937 resulting in the reservation by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor of Alberta on 31st October 1937 of three Bills passed by the Legislative Assembly, which three Bills have since, by the highest Court in Canada, been declared beyond the Legislative competence of Alberta and an invasion of Federal rights.

7. Fourthly and lastly at the 1938 Session recently prorogued and in further pursuance of its general scheme, the Social Credit Government obtained the enactment of five Statutes of which disallowance is now respectfully sought by your Petitioners. The said five Statutes are as follows:

1. "The Home Owners Security Act," Chapter 29, 1938.
2. "The Debt Adjustment Act, 1937, Amendment Act, 1938," Chapter 27, 1938.
3. "The Limitation of Actions Act 1935, Amendment Act, 1938," Chapter 28, 1938.
4. "The Tax Recovery Act 1938," Chapter 82, 1938.
5. "The 1938 Securities Tax Act," Chapter 7, 1938.

These will be separately dealt with later in this Petition.

8. Your Petitioners submit that the whole trend of the Alberta Social Credit Enactments above referred to, and of other Social Credit Statutes to which express reference need not here be made, is to isolate Alberta under a separate economy,—in trade and commerce, in its monetary and financial system and in other vital respects,—in defiance of or without regard to the provisions of the British North America Act and the Alberta Act, which two Acts delimit the powers and authority which may be exercised by any Provincial Government in Alberta. In substance we have here a definite attempt to disrupt confederation, so that the Alberta Social Credit

administration may have a free hand to establish in Alberta "the new economic order."

9. The Edmonton Chamber of Commerce is vitally interested in trade and commerce, in agriculture, in primary and secondary industry, in the well being of those engaged in all these activities, in the harmonious maintenance of Confederation, and in the welfare of Alberta and the Dominion as a whole. Consequently from time to time as considered appropriate, it has made to the Social Credit Government oral and written submissions, representations, suggestions and criticisms on all four of the branches of Social Credit legislation above referred to. It did so without avail in regard to the five Statutes of which disallowance is now sought.

10. Turning now to these five Statutes your Petitioners mention them *seriatim.*

The Home Owners Security Act. This Act prohibits any proceedings on a mortgage against a farm home where the Mortgage is dated prior to 1st March 1938. As to urban homes, regardless of the value of the property, the mortgagee who wishes to collect by Court proceedings the monies which he has lent, must first find and deposit $2,000.00 in cash in Court to be eventually paid to the owner of the property.

This Act is obviously confiscatory without compensation. It is equivalent to the complete cancellation of the farm home mortgage and in the majority of cases must mean the cancellation of the urban home mortgage also. It is in violation of invitations given to the citizens in other parts of Canada and elsewhere by the Social Credit Government to bring their surplus funds to Alberta as being a safe and attractive field for investment. Thousands from all parts of Canada have lent their savings, life insurance premiums etc., in good faith to assist home owners, either directly or through the agency of life insurance and loan companies. The Act ignores the machinery provided by the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act and conflicts with Federal policy.

The Debt Adjustment Act, 1937, *Amendment Act*, 1938. Debt Adjustment legislation was first enacted in Alberta in 1923. The present Act makes very drastic amendments and adds a new Part II which in effect puts all creditors at the mercy of a Board appointed by the Social Credit Government. Although the Act purports to be subject to the Bankruptcy Act and the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act, it is, your Petitioners submit, *ultra vires* as being bankruptcy legislation. It is also contrary to Dominion policy as to the method of granting relief to those engaged in Agriculture who may be financially embarrassed.

The Edmonton Chamber of Commerce has always given full recognition to the difficult conditions which have prevailed for some years past throughout Western Canada and desires that all debtors properly entitled to consideration receive such consideration. This Act also is confiscatory, and to arrive at its true purpose and intention must be read with the new Limitation of Actions Act, immediately following.

The Limitation of Actions Act, 1935, *Amendment Act*, 1938. This Statute reduces the time within which actions may now be taken in respect of all debts whatsoever incurred prior to 1st July 1936, to a little over two years from the present date. It provides that the only method to prevent such debts becoming Statute-barred is to obtain a new written agreement or to commence action. To commence action, however, requires a permit from the Debt Adjustment Board, a Board appointed by the Alberta Government under the Debt Adjustment Act. It is obvious that all the debtor need do is to refuse to make any such new written agreement and then, unless a creditor is willing to meet the views of the Board, he is refused permission to take any action. The one Statute outlaws the debt while the other restrains any action.

The Tax Recovery Act, 1938. The Chamber of Commerce does not complain of the whole of this Statute which is a consolidation and re-enactment of the Statute already in existence in Alberta for many years. It complains of a new provision, namely Section 21 (2) (a). By this provision if the Mortgagor or certain of his relatives redeem a property it is transferred to him or them free of all encumbrances. This provision offers a direct inducement to an owner of real property to default in his taxes in the hope that those having mortgages, charges or encumbrances on the property may not have sufficient funds to prevent forfeiture, and thus furnishes the owner with an additional method, and an easy one, of acquiring title clear of his liabilities. The intention again is to provide the owner a means of confiscation of other people's money.

The 1938 *Securities Tax Act.* This is a tax at the rate of 2 per cent on the principal amount of all mortgages. It treats as immaterial the fact that the other Statutes above cited prevent any attempt to enforce payment by the debtor. It likewise treats as immaterial that the Mortgage itself may be quite worthless, or may have been given as collateral security to a merchant or wholesale house, or to a Bank under the provisions of the Bank Act, or that the mortgagee may himself be financially embarrassed. The tax is imposed with fantastic penalties amounting to 60 per cent per annum for failure to pay. Here again we have the obvious confiscation of the monies of thousands of Canadian citizens.

Furthermore it makes no exception of mortgages to the Canadian Farm Loan Board and mortgages if any, held by the Soldier Settlement Board of Canada.

11. From the above it becomes necessary to ascertain, if possible, what the Legislature really had in mind to do, in support of its objective to do away with the present, as it asserts, obsolete financial system in Canada. In this connection your Petitioners submit the following as establishing that the purpose or intention is to bring about the wiping out entirely of all debt as a step towards Social Credit. In the issue of 7th April, 1938, of a newspaper "Today and Tomorrow" of which a Minister in the Social Credit Government is Editor, we find the following comment on the recent legislation:

"Important debt legislation which affects practically every producer within the Province was brought down at the Session. A move to slash debts horizontally was delayed for a year in order to test out the workings of the legislation already brought down.

Government realizing as no other Government, the enormity of debt in a country bursting with plenty for everybody is determined to abolish that anachronism through time. Until the full plan of Social Credit is in operation relief will be given to all debt sufferers as the legislation shows."

The pith and substance of the legislation in question therefore is to achieve, chiefly at the expense of the remainder of Canada, a wiping out of private debts without compensation and regardless of the debtor's ability to pay, all as being destructive of the existing financial system, and clearing the ground for "the new economic order."

12. Your Petitioners now respectfully propose to make some observations and submissions in relation to the principles which have governed the exercise of the power of disallowance in Canada. In the first place your Petitioners submit that the prominent and permanent place which this power has had in the history and constitutional practice of Canada ever since the Treaty of Paris in 1763 should be constantly borne in mind. Reference need only be made to the Quebec Act 1774, to the Constitutional Act 1791, to the Act of Union 1840, to the Resolutions of the Fathers of Confederation, to the British North America Act 1867 and finally to the fact that Alberta recognizes by its own Statutes that it was established as a Province subject to the power of disallowance of its legislation to be exercised in appropriate cases by your Excellency-in-Council. The views of the Imperial Government are expressed in a dispatch by the Right Honourable Edward Cardwell to the Governor General dated 3rd December, 1864, when acknowledging copies of the Quebec Resolutions. He there said:

"But upon the whole it appears to her Majesty's Government that precautions have been taken, which are obviously intended to secure to the Central Government the means of effective action through the several Provinces; and to guard against those evils which must inevitably arise, if any doubt were permitted to exist as to the respective limits of Central and Local authority. They are glad to observe that although large powers of legislation are intended to be vested in local bodies, yet the principle of central control has been steadily kept in view. The importance of this principle cannot be overrated. Its maintenance is essential to the practical efficiency of the system, and to its harmonious operation both in the General administration and in the Governments of the several provinces."

Sir Allen Aylesworth in his report in 1908 on the Cobalt Lake and Florence Mining Company case says:

"There seems much ground for the belief that the framers of the B.N.A. Act contemplated and probably intended that the power of disallowance should afford to vested interests and the rights of property a safeguard and protection against destructive legislation."

As late as 1918 it was pointed out by the then Minister of Justice that the power and corresponding duty to exercise disallowance are conferred for the benefit of the Provinces as well as for that of the Dominion at large, and that the system sanctioned by the Act of 1867 as interpreted by the highest Judicial authority provides for the federated Provinces a carefully balanced constitution, under which no one of the parts can pass laws for itself except under the control of the whole acting through the Governor General, Prov. Leg. Vol. 2, pp. 709-10.

13. Constitutional writers and others have been too much inclined, your Petitioners submit, to compartment the 70 years of Confederation into a number of periods in relation to the exercise of disallowance. Close examination however of the reports and recommendations of successive Ministers of Justice shows no very definite divergence of principle but rather that any divergence is largely a question of practice and of degree. All the Ministers appear, broadly speaking, to have adhered to the four grounds for disallowance laid down by Sir John A. MacDonald in his well known report in 1868.

14. On the question of abuse of power, oppression, irreparable injustice, confiscation, harshness, legislation of an outrageous character, or unjustified in principle, the high water mark of the argument for non-interference was reached during the five years when Sir Allen Aylesworth was Minister of Justice from 1906 to 1911. Nevertheless Sir Allen Aylesworth adopts as correct the principles embodied in Sir John A. MacDonald's report already mentioned. Vol. 2, p. 83. It becomes apparent in his reports in the Florence Mining Case, in the Hydro Electric Power Commission Case and as to discrimination against Dominion Corporations that on each occasion the Minister sets himself the inquiry as to whether the Provincial Act under scrutiny comes under the description of being "merely domestic or local in its character" but also does not affect any matter of Dominion interest. If it fulfils these two conditions it should not be interfered with. He is careful however to avoid limiting or defining the nature of the matters in which the Dominion is or may be interested.

Furthermore in the case of oppressive, unjust or dishonest legislation involving an abuse of power, but merely domestic or local in its character, Sir Allen Aylesworth makes abundantly clear the underlying reason or principle for refusing disallowance. It is simply that those injured and aggrieved have the remedy in their own hands, they have the right to dethrone the Provincial Government in question and deprive it of its power by voting it out of office. In brief the welfare of Canada as a whole and of its individual provinces, was to Sir Allen Aylesworth as to the other Ministers of Justice, the paramount consideration. Your Petitioners sub-

mit that under modern conditions of transportation, of the exchange of commodities and of trade and commerce, of finance and of the fluidity of capital and investments, such cases of the injury being confined to those who have the remedy in their own hands must necessarily become more and more rare in Canada. Those throughout the length and breadth of Canada suffering confiscation without compensation of their investments by the Statutes of which your Petitioners now seek disallowance have no such remedy and their only protection lies in the constitutional exercise by your Excellency-in-Council of disallowance.

15. In 1912 the next Minister of Justice the Hon. C. J. Doherty when dealing with the Alberta and Great Waterways Railway Legislation of Alberta, also makes it clear that there must be exceptional circumstances and some matters of general public or of Dominion interest must be affected before he will recommend disallowance. This viewpoint runs through all his reports and nowhere is it more apparent than in his report on the legislation mentioned. (p. 789). In this case the Alberta Act was not unlike the Ontario Cobalt Lake Statute involving the Florence Mining claims. While confiscatory in character compensation was provided. It is notable however that in each case the legislation was not of a general character but was concerned with one individual matter and with one individual property which in each case the Provincial Legislature considered demanded legislative action and legislative remedy. In neither case was any matter of Dominion interest affected nor was any general public interest involved. Mr. Doherty therefore left the Alberta Statute to its operation just as Sir Allen Aylesworth had left the Ontario Statute.

16. In 1913 Mr. Justice Iddington in the Companies Reference 48 S.C.R. p. 331 commented on the principles attaching to the power of disallowance and nowhere perhaps are they better discussed. At p. 380 he had the following to say:

> **"This veto power was given for the express purpose of preserving as a matter of expediency or public policy the rights of every one in the Dominion, corporate or individual, to enjoy such rights in as full measure as they existed at Confederation or might exist thereafter by later legislative development."**

and again

> **"It became from the time of Confederation thenceforward the duty of the Government of the Dominion to watch local legislation and see that nothing was enacted, even if intra vires the powers of a legislature, that would interfere with the prosperity of the Dominion as a whole.**
>
> **The rich heritage thus to be guarded was that in which every Canadian had a right to share and not that alone of any class of people either as mere provincials or otherwise.**
>
> **The right to dwell where one saw fit, and there or elsewhere follow his or her avocation was the common heritage of every Canadian and, for many years, of every Canadian company. If**

the right has not been well and sufficiently guarded, it must be because the veto power, the only power given by the "British North America Act" to guard it, has not been properly exercised and such rights duly preserved."

and still again

"To seek to apply it (i.e. disallowance) when the proposed legislation can only affect the rights of the people of the province concerned, may be offensive and in the domain of practical politics be an impossibility yet when the legislation proposed would manifestly improperly affect people elsewhere, or corporations created outside of the Province such as Dominion corporations resting upon the residual power of Parliament, or those of other Provinces, and thus affect the people of the whole Dominion, surely, the exercise of the power in that regard ought to be and to be held practicable."

and in the same Judgment Mr. Justice Duff at p. 424 had this to say:

"Those who were responsible for the scheme of Confederation deliberately rejected the American system of constitutional limitations. So far as Provincial legislation is concerned, they adopted the safeguard of investing the Governor-in-Council with a power of disallowance."

17. The views of Sir Lomer Gouin in 1922 when he recommended disallowance of a Nova Scotia Statute are, your Petitioners submit, pertinent. Sir Lomer does not suggest that the Provincial Statute in question was either unconstitutional or *ultra vires*. On the contrary he justifies his recommendation of disallowance upon the following grounds:

"(1) The Act in question is so extraordinary, so opposed to principles of right and justice that it falls within the category of legislation with respect to which it has been customary to invoke the power of disallowance.

(2) That he was not aware of any circumstance whatever moral, equitable or legal which can be pointed to in justification of the legislation now under review, and

(3) That the Legislature in passing the Act in question constituted itself a Court of Appeal upon the Supreme Court of Canada thereby removing the case from the Judicial tribunals especially established for the administration of justice in the Province."

18. Lastly, with respect, your Petitioners adopt the language of the Right Honourable Ernest Lapointe when he, as Minister of Justice in 1924, reported on the Mineral Taxation Act of Alberta and refused to accept a submission by Alberta somewhat along the lines of the views frequently expressed by the Ministers of the present Social Credit Government of Alberta namely that legislation enacted by the Province ought not to be re-

viewed or disallowed because the Provincial Legislature is sovereign and independent.

Mr. Lapointe there pointed out that this would entirely eliminate the power of disallowance and he used the following words:

> **"If, however, effect be given to these submissions of the Province, no place is left for the operation of the power of disallowance, which is, in express language, conferred by Sections 56 and 90 of 'The British North America Act, 1867'."**

And later, Mr. Lapointe pointed out that disallowance should be exercised where the public interest requires it, or paramount considerations affecting the Government of Canada and the maintenance of harmony in the administration of the affairs of the Dominion. He has this to say:

> **"While the discretion thus belonging to your Excellency-in-Council ought to be wisely exercised upon sound principles of public policy and having due regard to local powers of self government, there are cases in which disallowance affords a constitutional remedy, and it is implicit that the exercise of the power ought not to be withheld when the public interest requires that it should become effective. . . .**
>
> **There are paramount considerations affecting the Government of Canada and the general public interest which demand attention, and, whatever may have been said as to the propriety of recommendations for the disallowance of legislation which is thought to be unfair, unreasonable or unjust, it has whenever the occasion presented itself been maintained by the Ministers of Justice and has never been successfully controverted by any Province, that disallowance is the appropriate remedy for the maintenance of that harmony which it is essential should exist between Provincial Legislation and the administration of Dominion affairs within their proper domain."**

WHEREFORE YOUR PETITIONERS HUMBLY PRAY that the said Acts namely (1) The Home Owners Security Act, (2) The Debt Adjustment Act 1937, Amendment Act 1938, (3) Limitation of Actions Act 1935, Amendment Act 1938, (4) The Tax Recovery Act 1938, (5) The 1938 Securities Tax Act, be disallowed pursuant to the authority vested in your Excellency-in-Council by the British North America Act, for the following among the other reasons heretofore submitted.

REASONS

1. The said Acts are an abuse of power and not a *bona fide* exercise of the legislative authority of Alberta. In blunt language they are designed to plunder citizens, or more euphoniously to confiscate without compensation the property in Alberta of citizens, residing not only in Alberta but in other parts of Canada and elsewhere.

2. The said Acts are also designed to destroy the present economic order and to facilitate if possible the establishment in Alberta of "a new economic order," something unmistakably beyond the legislative authority of Alberta and disruptive of Confederation.

3. The said Acts are not merely local or domestic in their character or referable to property and civil rights within the Province. On the contrary they are gravely injurious (a) to the Dominion as a whole and to the credit of the Dominion (b) to the maintenance of that harmony which it is essential should exist between Provincial legislation and the administration of Dominion affairs within their proper domain, (c) to the harmonious relationship of other provinces with Alberta, (d) to the rights, properties and interests of tens of thousands of Canadian citizens and others resident elsewhere than in Alberta.

4. The said Acts are designed to conflict and do conflict with Dominion statutes and policies or (as stated by that eminent constitutional authority the late Hon. David Mills) "matters in which it is competent under the constitution to the Dominion to have a policy" *inter alia* The Bankruptcy Act, The Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act, The Bank Act, The Soldier Settlement Act, and The Canadian Farm Loan Act.

5. The matters dealt with by the said Acts are of general public and Dominion interest, and are of so extraordinary a character and so opposed to principles of right and justice that they clearly fall within the category of legislation with respect to which it has been customary to invoke the power of disallowance.

6. That they unjustifiably hamper and interfere with the operation, properties, and assets, of Dominion corporations, such as trading companies, Life Insurance Companies, Banks, Trust Companies, and Mortgage and Loan Companies deriving their authority from and exercising powers granted to them by Dominion Legislation.

7. The said Acts are destructive of public and private credit in Alberta, and will be most injurious to the credit of Canada itself having regard to the large investments in Alberta by people residing in Great Britain, the United States of America and elsewhere.

AND YOUR PETITIONERS WILL EVER PRAY.

EDMONTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,

L. Y. CAIRNS,
President.

J. BOYD McBRIDE,
Chairman of
Legislation Committee.

JOHN BLUE,
Manager-Secretary.

Edmonton, Alberta, 11th May, 1938.